

REMARKS

I. Summary

This amendment and response is in reply to the Final Office Action mailed July 7, 2009 ("the Office Action"). Claims 1-4 and 6-18 were rejected.

In this response, Assignee has amended claims 1, 2, and 12. The amendments of claims 1, 2, and 12 are for grammatical and readability purposes. No new subject matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are currently pending.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102: Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-16, and 18

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-16, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lemmons (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0028873). In making the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection, the Final Office Action also relies on Markel (U.S. Pat. App. No. 60/354,745), which Lemmons incorporates by reference. Assignee respectfully traverses these rejections.

As discussed during the Interview, neither Lemmons nor Markel teach all of the features recited by independent claims 1 and 12 for at least two reasons. First, neither Lemmons nor Markel teach providing, with a calculator, a first set of oriented views of a preregistered picture in various orientations. Lemmons describes storing a label and painting that label on a particular object or a blank space. (Lemmons, ¶[0049].) Lemmons provides using pattern recognition techniques on a displayed video signal to generate placement and contour data for placing the label. (Lemmons, ¶[0070].) As discussed during the Interview, Lemmons cannot teach claim 1 because the system in Lemmons cannot know the placement or contour data needed to display the stored labels until the video signal is actually displayed.

Moreover, while the Final Office Action asserts that the "moving location" tag described by Lemmons teaches the feature of providing, with a calculator, a first set of oriented views of the preregistered picture in various orientations, Assignee respectfully submits that, as discussed during the Interview, a "moving location" tag is not a first set of oriented views of a preregistered picture. For example, in paragraphs 83 and 84 of

Lemmons, which refer also to Markel, the tags are described as consisting of data inserted between images, which indicates x and y coordinates and contour data of an object. In contrast to the coordinate and contour data, claim 1 recites that the oriented views are views of a preregistered picture in various orientations.

Markel also does not teach providing a first set of oriented views of a preregistered picture in various orientations. As discussed during the Interview, the hot spots are not preregistered pictures, but, as shown in Figure 7 of Markel, are simply hyperlinks defined as geometric shapes using a coordinate system. As a hot spot is not a preregistered picture, Markel cannot teach providing a first set of oriented views of a preregistered picture in various orientations.

Secondly, neither Lemmons nor Markel teach associating each oriented view of a first set of oriented views with an orientation index that identifies the physical orientation of the oriented view of the preregistered picture and selecting the orientation index of the oriented view having the same orientation as an area in a current image. Lemmons does not associate an orientation index with a label. As Lemmons describes, the labels are placed in a video signal according to placement and contour data previously generated by pattern recognition techniques on a displayed video signal. Lemmons relies on the placement and contour data, not an orientation index, to place the stored label. Hence, Lemmons does not teach associating each oriented view with an orientation index or selecting the orientation index of the oriented view having the same orientation as said area in the current image.

Markel also does not associate an orientation index with a hot spot. As shown in Figure 7, Markel relies on frame time codes, denoted by "<time>" and "</time>" for creating a hot spot in a video stream. (Markel, p. 12, ll. 10-14.) Markel then creates the hot spot in the video stream based on the frame time code. Regardless of the images shown in the video stream, Markel is designed to create a hot spot at the designated frame time code. Since Markel is designed to create hot spots in a video stream based on time codes regardless of the images displayed in the video stream, Markel cannot teach associating each oriented view of the first set of oriented views with an orientation index that identifies the physical orientation of the oriented view of the preregistered picture and

selecting the orientation index of the oriented view having the same orientation as said area in the current image.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Lemmons and Markel. For at least the same reasons as claim 1, dependent dependent claims 2-4, 6-11, and 14-18 are also patentable over Lemmons and Markel.

Claim 12 is directed to a system that practices aspects of the method recited by amended claim 1. In particular, claim 12 recites “a calculator for providing a set of oriented views of said picture for various orientations and associating with each oriented view an orientation index that identifies the physical orientation of the oriented view of the preregistered picture associated with the corresponding orientation index.”

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103: Claims 10 and 17

A. Claim 10

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemmons in view of Wixson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,254). However, claim 10 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 because Wixson does not make up for the deficiencies of Lemmons. Wixson is generally directed to a method and apparatus for detecting and tracking objects within a sequence of images. (Wixson, col. 1, ll. 7-9). Wixson describes using various calculations to detect an object in well-lit scenes and another set of calculations for detecting an object in poorly-lit scenes. (Wixson, col. 1, ll. 59-64). Neither Lemmons nor Wixson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest providing, with a calculator, a first set of oriented views of the preregistered picture in various orientations; associating each oriented views of the first set of oriented views with an orientation index that identifies the physical orientation of the oriented view of the preregistered picture; or, selecting the orientation index of the oriented view having the same orientation as an area in a current image.

Hence, for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, dependent claim 10 is patentable over Lemmons in view of Wixson. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claim 17

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemmons in view of Martinolich (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0023971). However, claim 17 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 because Martinolich does not make up for the deficiencies of Lemmons. Martinolich is generally directed to a system and method for the production of interactive video. (Martinolich, ¶[0002].) Martinolich describes using a video switch to provide graphics data from various input video sources. (Martinolich, ¶[0020].) However, neither Lemmons nor Wixson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest providing, with a calculator, a first set of oriented views of the preregistered picture in various orientations; associating each oriented views of the first set of oriented views with an orientation index that identifies the physical orientation of the oriented view of the preregistered picture; or, selecting the orientation index of the oriented view having the same orientation as an area in a current image.

Hence, for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, dependent claim 10 is patentable over Lemmons in view of Wixson. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

IV. Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Assignee respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, he is requested to contact the Assignee's undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joshua E. Garfield/
Joshua E. Garfield
Registration No. 58,416
Attorney for Assignee